

Message

---

**From:** Desroches, Neil (NWD) [/O=COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS/OU=MASSMAIL-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=NEIL.DESROCHES]  
**Sent:** 9/29/2010 6:41:50 PM  
**To:** Farak, Sonja (DPH) [/O=COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS/OU=MassMail-01/cn=Recipients/cn=Sonja.Farak]  
**Subject:** RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Ok, i expect to have an answer for you in half an hour. Thanks for the update!

---

**From:** Farak, Sonja (DPH)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2010 2:35 PM  
**To:** Desroches, Neil (NWD)  
**Subject:** RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10  
Hi Neil-

Thanks for the clarification with the numbers (my guess is that [REDACTED] was a prior arrest???). As for my case in Pittsfield, the ADA wrote me: "Based on what I can gather about the case for tomorrow, there is a chance it could be resolved without a trial. Would it be alright to have you on-call?" So I'll be on call tomorrow for Pittsfield (and probably not need to go), so should anything change with your case and you need me in Orange, there is a decent chance that I will be available, though I am not sure what Rebecca's schedule is. Please just keep me informed what is going on --- Thanks.

-Sonja

Sonja Farak  
Drug Analysis Lab

---

**From:** Desroches, Neil (NWD)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 9:55 PM  
**To:** Farak, Sonja (DPH)  
**Subject:** RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Sonja, I cannot figure out where the [REDACTED] figures into the [REDACTED] trial. She has an separate open case involving possession of Class B (Oxycontin), and we do not have the certs in that matter, so I cannot be certain it is not connected to that matter. Long story short, [REDACTED] is not related to the matter shceduled for trial.

The defense attorney brought the cases forward to tomorrow to tender a plea (which is largely agreed), so I will let you know as soon as I hear the result.

---

**From:** Farak, Sonja (DPH)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 1:20 PM  
**To:** Desroches, Neil (NWD)  
**Subject:** RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10  
Neil-

So I think I've got this right --- the drug lab numbers needed for trial are:

[REDACTED] (def. listed as [REDACTED] chemist = Rebecca)

[REDACTED] (def. listed as [REDACTED] chemist = Sonja)

[REDACTED] (def. listed as [REDACTED] chemist = Sonja)? Is this submission part of the case? Thanks for your help.

-Sonja

---

**From:** Desroches, Neil (NWD)

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2010 5:48 PM

**To:** Farak, Sonja (DPH)

**Subject:** RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Hi Sonja, first, I apologize on Dave's behalf for his lack of responsiveness, I really appreciate you're being on top of this issue and making us aware.

I believe most of the confusion comes from the fact that the drugs submitted under [REDACTED] are, were seized as part of the same execution of a search warrant. Technically, we would probably need both you and Rebecca to testify, but, I understand how impractical that is and I'm sure I can work something out. This may all be a moot point, though, because the defense attorney contacted me today and I believe a resolution short of trial is likely. I will keep you posted.

Thank you!!!

---

**From:** Farak, Sonja (DPH)

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2010 11:13 AM

**To:** Desroches, Neil (NWD)

**Subject:** FW: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Neil-

I just found out that you will be the ADA in Orange this Thursday (Sept. 30, 2010) taking over for David Lemasa on the [REDACTED]. I've been trying to get in touch with Dave for about a month and a half regarding this case, and am hopeful that I will be able to get my questions answered from you. Please see the forwarded message that I sent him on August 5th. If you need to contact me, you can always email me or give me a call at the lab (413-545-2607). Thanks.

-Sonja

Sonja Farak

Drug Analysis Lab

---

**From:** Farak, Sonja (DPH)

**Sent:** Thursday, August 05, 2010 11:08 AM

**To:** Lemasa, David (NWD)

**Subject:** v. [REDACTED]

Hi Dave-

I received your summons for the [REDACTED] trial scheduled for September 30, 2010 and I have a few questions/comments. First, the Drug Certificate numbers listed on the summons are [REDACTED]. The defendant listed on the first number [REDACTED] is listed as [REDACTED] but I was not the chemist that preformed the analysis on this sample

(Rebecca Pontes is). Also submitted the same day by the Athol police were [REDACTED] chemist = Rebecca). As for the second number [REDACTED] the lab does not have a submission for that number (or any number above 0600 for that matter). I looked up submission [REDACTED] thinking that it might be a typo, and, although I am the chemist for that number, the defendant was listed as [REDACTED] Finally I looked up the defendants name [REDACTED] and found one other submission that had that name on it which I had analyzed [REDACTED] With all this stated, would you mind clearing up for me which drug lab certificate numbers are actually involved with this case?

Second, I may have a conflict on September 30 as I am suppose to be in Pittsfield District Court that day, though it is early and things may change (note as of Sept. 27th = the Pittsfield case is still on).

Thanks.

-Sonja

Sonja Farak  
Drug Analysis Lab